

## REMARKS

### A. Objection to Claims

In the Office Action of March 12, 2003, claims 1-33 were objected because claim 1 inadvertently used “web” instead of “planar area.” Claim 1 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, the objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn. In addition, since claim 1 has not been rejected based on the prior art, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct an obvious error of form and so the amendment is not being made for reasons of patentability as defined in *Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd*, 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (*en banc*), *overruled in part*, 535 U.S. 722, 122 S. Ct. 1831 (2002).

### B. 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 53-57, 60, 61 and 64 were rejected as being anticipated under § 102(b) by Saitoh et al. Applicant traverses this rejection because Saitoh et al. is silent as to diminishing skewing of the portion of the web during the pressing. Accordingly, the claims are not anticipated by Saitoh et al. and so the rejection is improper.

Despite the rejection, claims 53-55 have been canceled and claims 56, 60 and 64 have been amended so as to depend directly on claim 65, which has been deemed to contain allowable subject matter. With this amendment, claims 56, 57, 60, 61 and 64 depend directly or indirectly on claim 65. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 53-57, 60, 61 and 64 has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Please note that the cancellation of claims 53-55 is not being presented for reasons of

patentability as defined in *Festo*. The claims are being canceled in order to expedite prosecution and to have other claims issued in a patent. Further evidence that the claims are being canceled for reasons not regarding patentability, is that Applicant has set forth reasons why the rejection of the claim is improper.

Please note that the amendments of claims 56, 60 and 64 are being made to provide additional patent coverage for the process for manufacturing a label as recited in claim 65. Accordingly, the amendments are not being presented for reasons of patentability as defined in *Festo*.

**C.     35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 58, 59, 62 and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 as being obvious in view of Saitoh et al. and Barry. Claims 58 and 59 have been amended so as to depend directly on claim 65, which has been deemed to contain allowable subject matter. In addition, claims 62 and 63 depend directly or indirectly on claim 60, which has been amended to depend on claim 65. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 58, 59, 62 and 63 has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Please note that the amendments of claims 58 and 59 are being made to provide additional patent coverage for the process for manufacturing a label as recited in claim 65. Accordingly, the amendments are not being presented for reasons of patentability as defined in *Festo*.

**D.     Claims 1-52**

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 1-52 have been allowed.

**E. Claim 65**


Applicant notes with appreciation that claim 65 has been deemed to contain allowable subject matter. Claim 65 is being amended in independent form. Accordingly, claim 65 should be allowed.

Please note that claim 65 has been amended so as to incorporate subject matter that was inherently present in the claim. Accordingly, the amendment of claim 65 is not being presented for reasons of patentability as defined in *Festo*.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the arguments above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims 1-52 and 56-65 are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Freeman  
Registration No. 34,483  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER  
GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

Dated: June 4, 2003